IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE P.R.RAMAN
&
THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANTONY DOMINIC

WEDNESDAY, THE 14TH MARCH 2007 / 23RD PHALGUNA 1928

WA.No. 564 of 2006()

AGAINST THE JUDGEMENT IN OP.20337/1996 Dated 08/08/2005
.....

APPELLANTS: RESPONDENTS:
---

1. STATE OF KERALA,
   REP. BY THE CHIEF SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT,
   SECRETARIAT, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.

2. THE VIGILANCE TRIBUNAL,
   THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.

BY GOVERNMENT PLEADER SRI SANDESH RAJA

RESPONDENT/ APPELLANT:

S. VASANTHAKUMARI,
SWEEPER-CUM-PEON, OFFICE OF THE VIGILANCE TRIBUNAL
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.

BY ADV. SRI.B.RAGUNATHAN

THIS WRIT APPEAL HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON 14/03/2007, ALONG WITH WA NO. 883 OF 2006, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:

P.R.RAMAN & ANTONY DOMINIC,JJ.

W.A.NOS.564 & 883 OF 2006

Dated this the 14th day of March, 2007

JUDGMENT

Raman, J.

Both the above writ appeals raise common question. W.A.No.564/2006 arises out of the judgment in O.P.No.20337/1996 and W.A.No.883/2006 arises out of the judgment in O.P.No.19454/95. Petitioners in these original petitions sought regularisation of their service. They were appointed through Employment Exchange. Following the judgment in W.A.No.96/2000 and W.P.(C).Nos.37371/2003 a direction was issued by the learned Single Judge to consider the matter in the light of the above judgments and to extend the eligible benefits to the petitioners also. Pursuant to the judgment of the learned Single Judge, the petitioner in O.P.NO.20337/1996 was regularised in service as per Annexure-R1 order dated 17/1/2006 and the petitioner in O.P.NO.19454/95 was regularised in service as per Annexure-R1 order dated 9/11/2005 produced in that case. These writ appeals have been preferred long thereafter and hence the compliance of the judgment is not during the pendency of these appeals. It is submitted by the learned

Government Pleader appearing on behalf of the State that the correctness of the judgment in W.A.No.96/2000 was canvassed before the Apex Court by filing a Special Leave Petition and the same is pending. According to the Government Pleader, interim direction was issued only as against re-induction pursuant to the termination.

2. In the above facts and circumstances of the case and in the light of the fact that the petitioners have already been regularised long prior to the filing of these writ appeals, we do not think the point of law canvassed in these writ appeals need be decided, as the matter has become infructuous.

Appeals are dismissed.

P.R.RAMAN,
Judge.

ANTONY DOMINIC,
Judge.

kcv.